

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Please replace Figs. 1-3 with the attached revised Figs. 1-3.

Attachment: Two (2) Replacement Sheet(s)

**REMARKS**

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph**

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner asserts that the newly added limitation in claim 1 that the output voltage of the current circuit is “always” higher than the output voltage of the second rectifier circuit constitutes new matter. Applicants are amending claim 1 to remove the term “always.” Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Further, Applicants are canceling claim 3, rendering moot the rejection of this claim.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner asserts that if the term “always” is removed from claim 1, then claims 1-3 would be subject to the previous rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,645,741 to Terayama et al. (hereinafter “Terayama”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,148,001 to Stava. Applicants have amended claim 1 to specify that the current controlling circuit controls a current that is outputted from the transformer, and that a third rectifier circuit rectifies the controlled current.

Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over Terayama, because Terayama fails to teach or suggest a current circuit that comprises, *inter alia*, “a current controlling circuit which controls a current that is outputted from said transformer” and “a third rectifier circuit which rectifies said controlled current” (emphasis added). On the contrary, Fig. 3 of Terayama shows that the current outputted from transformer T1 is immediately rectified by the auxiliary power rectifier DR4. Terayama then uses a current controlling circuit to control the rectified current. This structural difference clearly distinguishes claim 1 over Terayama. Further, Stava

fails to remedy this deficiency in Terayama. Therefore, we believe that claim 1 distinguishes over Terayama and Stava, at least by virtue of the aforementioned differences. Further, claim 2 is also patentable over Terayama and Stava, at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1. As noted above, Applicants are canceling claim 3.

**Interview Summary**


A telephonic interview was conducted on May 15, 2007, in which the Examiner indicated that the current amendments to the claims would distinguish the claims over Terayama. Further, the Examiner asserted that the current controlling circuit 11 functions differently in the various embodiments disclosed in the specification, and that it would be necessary to amend the drawings and specification to distinguish between the active current controlling circuit in Fig. 1 and the passive current controlling circuit in Figs. 2 and 3. Therefore, Applicants are changing the reference numbers of the current controlling circuits in Figs. 1-3 and amending the specification accordingly.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Chid S. Iyer  
Registration No. 43,355

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

**65565**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 22, 2007